DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California MICHAEL A. SHEKEY, State Bar No. 143436 2 Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 3 300 South Spring Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2520 5 Attorneys for Complainant 6 7 BEFORE THE 8 9

BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2.6

2.7

In the Matter of the Accusation Against:

12

MICHAEL S. WEISSENFLUH Post Office Box 861 Rolkaway Beach, Oregon 97136

Certificate No. 47406,

Respondent.

NO. AC-97-20

STIPULATION IN SETTLEMENT OF ACCUSATION AND ORDER

Respondent, Michael S. Weissenfluh, and the California Board of Accountancy (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") through its counsel, Deputy Attorney General Michael A. Shekey, do hereby enter into the following Stipulation:

Respondent Michael S. Weissenfluh (hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent") hereby acknowledges receipt of Accusation No. AC-97-20 (attached hereto as Exhibit "A"), a Statement to Respondent, a Request for Discovery, excerpts of California Government Code, sections 11507.5, 11507.6 and 11507.7, and a Notice of Defense.

1 / /

- 2. On or about August 1, 1997, Accusation No. AC-97-20 was served on Respondent on behalf of Carol B. Sigmann, in her official capacity as Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy.
- 3. Respondent has fully considered the charges and allegations contained within Accusation No. AC-97-20 on file with the Board, and Respondent has been fully advised with regard to his rights in this matter.
- 4. Respondent is fully aware of the right to a hearing on the charges and allegations contained within said Accusation No. AC-97-20, his right to reconsideration, appeal, and all other rights which may be accorded pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California.
- 5. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily waives his right to a hearing, reconsideration, appeal, and any and all other rights which may be accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California with regard to Accusation No. AC-97-20.
- 6. Respondent has been and is presently representing himself in this matter. The Board has been and is represented by Daniel E. Lungren, Attorney General, through Michael A. Shekey, Deputy Attorney General.
- 7. The parties hereto agree that the Stipulation recited herein shall be null and void and not binding upon the parties unless and until approved by the Board.

- 8. This Stipulation is made for the purpose of settling Accusation No. AC-97-20. It is only for the purpose of this proceeding and any other subsequent proceeding between the Board and Respondent, or any action taken by or before any governmental body responsible for licensing accountants.
- 9. Respondent admits that if the allegations, as contained within the subject Accusation, were proven at an administrative trial, his license would be subject to appropriate discipline, including revocation.
- 10. Based on the admissions and waivers set forth hereinabove, Respondent agrees that the Board may issue the following Order:

ORDER

Accountancy Certificate No. 47406, previously issued to Respondent Michael S. Weissenfluh, is hereby revoked.

In consideration of Respondent's stipulation of revocation, the Board will not seek reimbursement of related and accrued investigation and prosecution costs in this matter at this time. Should the Respondent seek reinstatement in the future, however, he agrees to reimburse the Board for such related costs incurred in this action prior to the Board's consideration of his Petition for Reinstatement.

23 / / /

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

22

- 24 | / / /
- 25 | / / /
- 26 | / / /
- 27 | / / /

SUBMISSION OF STIPULATION

1.7

1.8

I have read and reviewed the terms and conditions of the Stipulation and Order set forth hereinabove. I understand that this is an offer in settlement made to the Board, and will not be effective unless and until the Board formally adopts said Stipulation as its Decision in this matter. I expressly acknowledge that if adopted, my Certificate No. 47406 will be revoked, effective the day on which the Board adopts said Stipulation as its Decision in this matter. I voluntarily enter into the instant Stipulation and agree to be bound by the terms and conditions of the disciplinary Order herein.

DATED: 11-3.97	Museu D2
DATED:	MICHAEL S. WEISSENFLUH
	Respondent

4.

SUBMISSION

The foregoing is submitted to the California Board of Accountancy for consideration and adoption as its Decision in Accusation No. AC-97-20. In the event that the Board rejects the proposed Stipulation in this matter, the admissions of facts and characterizations of law set forth hereinabove shall be null, void and inadmissible in any proceeding involving the parties to it, and a hearing in this matter shall be scheduled forthwith.

DATED: _________

DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General f the State of California

MICHAEL A SHEKEY
Deputy Artorney General

Attorneys for Complainant

ADOPTION AND DECISION

The Stipulation in Settlement of Accusation and Order
in this matter is formally adopted by the California Board of
Accountancy as the Decision in the matter of the Accusation No.
AC-97-20 against Michael S. Weissenfluh, on this <u>8th</u> day of
December, 1997, and shall become effective on the7th
day of January , 1998.

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY

Weissen.Stp 0354110-LA96AD2446

2 3 4 5	DANIEL E. LUNGREN, Attorney General of the State of California MICHAEL A. SHEKEY, State Bar No. 143436 Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 300 South Spring Street, Suite 500 Los Angeles, California 90013 Telephone: (213) 897-2520 Attorneys for Complainant
6	
7 8	BEFORE THE
9	BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
10	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11	In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. AC-97-20
12	Against: MICHAEL S. WEISSENFLUH ACCUSATION
13	Post Office Box 861) Rolkaway Beach, Oregon 97136)
14	Certificate No. 47406,
15	Respondent.
16	
17	
18	Complainant, Carol B. Sigmann, as cause for
19	disciplinary action, alleges:
20	1. Complainant is the Executive Officer of the
21	California State Board of Accountancy (hereinafter referred to as
22	the "Board"), and makes and files this Accusation solely in her
23	official capacity.
24	LICENSE STATUS
25	2. On or about January 30, 1987, Certified Number
26	47406 was issued by the Board to Michael S. Weissenfluh
27	(hereinafter referred to as the "Respondent"), and at all times

relevant herein, that certificate was currently in full force and effect. Subsequently, Respondent's Certificate expired on June 1, 1996 and has not since been renewed.

STATUTES

- 3. This Accusation is made in reference to the following statutes of the California Business and Professions Code (hereinafter referred to as the "Code"):
 - A. Section 5100, in pertinent part, provides that the Board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew any permit or certificate issued by the Board, or may censure the holder of any such permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct which includes, but is not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:

* * *

"(h) Fiscal dishonesty or breach of fiduciary responsibility of any kind.

* * *

- (j) Embezzlement, theft, misappropriation of funds or property, or obtaining money, property, or other valuable consideration by fraudulent means or false pretenses."
- B. Section 5107 provides, in pertinent part, that the Board may request the administrative law judge as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found in violation of Section 5100 (b), (c), (h), (i), or (j) to pay to the Board all reasonable costs of investigation and

prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees.

FACTS

firm of Bjerre, Miller & Weissenfluh, solicited four clients! to invest in Moviescope, Inc. so as to help Moviescope, Inc. raise capital. In agreeing to help Moviescope raise capital, Respondent agreed to accept as compensation 20,000 shares! of Moviescope, Inc. stock. Respondent, as well as his partners, Mads Bjorn Bjerre and Joseph M. Miller, had authority to sign the aforementioned investors' checks, which require two signatures, except for P.K., which required only one signature. Subsequently, Respondent informed Bjerre and Miller that he was now having the clients, themselves, co-sign their own checks.

5. In or about late June/early July, 1994, Bjerre and Miller reviewed financial statements prepared by Respondent, and noted therein that the investment in Moviescope, Inc. by T.B. and A.S. had far exceeded the original commitment. 31

19 | / / /

^{1.} The identity of clients T.B., A.S., P.K., and B.A. will be made know to Respondent subsequent to a discovery request.

^{2.} Within a 1993 tax return for Moviescope, Inc., it indicated therein that Respondent had a 25.9 percent interest in the company.

^{3.} Respondent subsequently informed his partners, Bjerre and Miller, that the original investment commitment by both T.B. and A.S. was \$100,000 each. Bjerre and Miller discovered that their individual investment amounts had then totaled \$225,000 and \$150,000, respectively.

7. As a result of the conduct described in paragraph 4, 5 and 6, Respondent is subject to discipline under Business and Professions Code, sections 5100 (h) and (j), by forging client signatures on their respective checks under the Respondent's control, and by investing the funds in a "high risk" movie venture, Moviescope, Inc.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters alleged herein, and that following said hearing, a decision be issued:

- 1. Revoking or suspending Certificate Number 47406, heretofore issued to Respondent Michael S. Weissenfluh;
- 2. Directing Respondent to pay to the Board of Accountancy a reasonable sum for its investigation and prosecution costs of this action, including attorneys' fees; and / / /

21 / / /

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

26

27

4. Subsequently, T.B. and A.S. stated in affidavits that their signatures on certain checks processed through City National Bank were forged. City National Bank agreed that the checks in question had been forged, and as a result, reimbursed T.B. \$100,000 and A.S. \$50,000 for the check forgeries.

^{5.} Under Bjerre and Miller's fidelity bond, T.B. and A.S. were reimbursed an additional \$100,000 and \$75,000 respectively. Hence, both T.B. and A.S. were made whole on their investments except for the original \$25,000 investment.

1	 Taking such other and further action as the Board
2	deems necessary and proper.
3	
4	DATED: July 22, 1997
5	
6	
7	CAROL B. SIGMANN
8	Executive Officer U
9	Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
10	Complainant
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	03541110-LA96AD2446
2	